

# THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 7416.

## AFFAIRS IN WASHINGTON.

### From the National Capital.

INQUIRY INTO THE AFFAIRS OF THE MILITARY ASYLUMS—THE COLLING STEAMERS—THE ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH—PROGRAMME OF THE LOBBY MEMBERS.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

Another interesting day to Congress, and but little business done. The petition of E. K. Collins and associates was presented to the Senate and referred. Their position is that there are no American ocean steamers which can compete with their ships, but that their original contract will not enable them to keep up a successful competition with the British line, sustained by government and port. They ask Congress to terminate their contract and dispose of their ships, so that they may be relieved with cost. The opinion is generally expressed by member that the petition will be granted, and Com. Vanderbilt put in nomination.

An inquiry was introduced as to the manner and cost of keeping invalid soldiers at the military asylums here and at Harrodsburg. This will prove a rich subject, and exhibit how the public money is squandered. The estimate is that every soldier costs the government \$200 per annum at the asylums, while less than half the amount would render him much more comfortable at home with his family.

The bill to prohibit the importation of slaves was introduced, and but little discussion had taken place upon it.

John C. Breckinridge's bill to prohibit the importation of slaves is a good thing it is up, probably, the government with five hundred thousand dollars' worth of diplomatic correspondence of the revolution—six volumes—for distribution among public institutions and foreign governments and Gov. Marcy recommends the necessary approbation.

The treaty with England has not been communicated to the Senate. It is still under Cabinet consideration.

The New York Post Office will still hang fire before the Attorney General. It is extremely doubtful whether a good title can be secured. There is prodigious outside pressure made on the President and Attorney General.

Quite a number of gentlemen are here from New York to get the Secretary of the Navy to furnish a vessel to assist in laying the wires for the submarine telegraph between Newfoundland and the coast of Ireland.

Senator Mallory arrived here to-day, and is stopping at Willard's. I understand that the Florida Legislature is democratic, which secures his re-election to the Senate.

The great lobby interest—the third house—has been wisely arranged and divided off so that more effective work can be done. Thurlow Weed has been appointed to superintend affairs in the House, and the Cavalier Whig to regulate the Senate. They look after the details in their respective divisions. Among other masters engaged in their plans are the abolition of duties on wool and the return of the duties that have been paid on railroad iron for the last ten years. These men are not satisfied with obtaining \$100,000,000 worth of the public domain, but they now seek to press down the poor farmer to benefit a few wool manufacturers by taking the duty off that article, and compelling the government to pay back several millions of dollars in the shape of returned duties on railroad iron. As long as there is an acre of public land or a dollar in the treasury these rascous rogues will not rest quiet.

On the other side Mr. Sanderson, of the Philadelphia News, will reply to the attack on his character in Kenneth Taylor's speech at Raleigh, promising some rich political disclosures.

Frequent complaints bring made of neglect by federal agents of the interests of the Indians in Minnesota, Gen. Sibley's visit to Washington has some connection with that subject.

Mr. Campbell, of Ohio, in vain endeavored to-day to rid the House of debate on the President's message, in order to proceed to the consideration of the Appropriations bills. Many members still desire to speak on topics contained in the message.

## THIRTY-FOURTH CONGRESS.

SECOND SESSION.

### Bills.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an argument in support of the jurisdiction of the Court and the claim of its jurisdiction over the same grounds as adduced in his remarks of Monday. He instanced various authorities in support of his propositions. He defended at length the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise. The Missouri Compromise was a wise measure, such as will pass the usages of all nations and all countries. Nobody ever questioned its constitutionality until within a brief period.

Mr. Calhoun in 1838, though believing it was unconstitutional, did not say it was unconstitutional. That was well done. Mr. Blair then branched the idea that slavery might extend into the Territories. The Court is now called upon to restrain an institution which by act of Congress was to be restrained. He argued that the slaveholding states were not to be left to regulate their institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. He believed they could not be left to regulate in their sovereign capacity and constitute making power. That was well done, but he was willing to abide by the decision of the Court as to the power of the territories to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. B. Coxon, from same committee, will make a minority report, leaving out the Court of Inquiry which the Senate bill contains, and leaving it with the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to initiate the other proceedings of the bill. The bill is immortal. After a fair examination and investigation of their case by the proper authority. This amendment, I am persuaded, will not be adopted by the House. It is probably general enough, and it is amendable. It could be made a Senate bill, and it would be well to have this arrangement or amalgamation in the final bill. It will be better if the subject has ended with the vote of the Senate.

The Slave Case in the United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 15, 1856.

The case of Fred Scott was resumed. Mr. Johnson presented precedents in support of his views on the question of citizenship of a negro.

Mr. Blair said his colleague (Mr. Curtis) proposed to argue the moral and constitutional of the Missouri compromise.

He then proceeded with an